



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,944	11/18/2003	L. Keith Lipman	INW00053	7265
22862	7590	12/22/2008		
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			EXAMINER TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2169	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/716,944

**Applicant(s)**

LIPMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Cam Y T. Truong

**Art Unit**

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/309)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant inserted a priority claim to U.S. Patent application ser. no. 10/232257 filed on 8/30/2002 and which claims benefit of U.S. provisional patent application 60/316782 filed 8/31/2001; thus, the rejection for claims 1-2 and 16-18 under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) in view of Kitmura and Panichkul, the rejection for claims 1-3, 5 under 103(a) in view of Shutt and Panichkul, and the rejection for claims 1-3 and 5 under 103(a) in view of Shutt and Haahr, and the rejection for claim 3 as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and Shutt, are withdrawn.

The rejection 101 for claims 1-15 is withdrawn based on the amended claims 1-15.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 1, 2, 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: there is a typo error for the term "the metadata fields"; thus, the term "the metadata fields" should be written as "the metadata data fields" in claim 1, line 7; claim 16, line 8; claim 2, line 2 .

4. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 12 depends on claim 11, thus, the limitation "the matter folder" in claim 12, lines 2-3 should be written as "the appropriate matter file" to make claim clearer. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri (US 6915299) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537).

As to claim 1, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

" a processor programmed for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein

each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder 68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

"processor programmed for automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for documents (figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g. the fields 83, 84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set for the respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some property fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The completed fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines 52-65), the properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields,

"when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as each document library preferably has its own set of properties. The properties are preferably any type of meta-information that may be associated with a document, e.g., meta-information such as state of a document, expire-time, work-flow assignment, arbitrary groupings made by disjoint collections of documents, and the like. The set of properties for the document library are relevant to

the type of documents it contains. Each document in a document library may have no value or a valid value for each of the properties in its containing document library's property set. The values for each of the properties for a particular document make up the document's properties values set 71. Only one properties values set 71 is shown in FIG. 2, but each document preferably includes its own properties value set. As is described further below, to facilitate searching and categorization, it is better that each document in a document library have values set meaningfully. The properties values set 71 for a document is preferably maintained with other document metadata, but may be associated with the document in another manner. For example, if the document library contains documents related to motor specifications for a brand of cars, the properties for that document library may include the motor type, the author of the specification, the years in which the motor was sold, the displacement of the engine, and the like (col. 6, lines 9-34).

The above information shows that a document is saved in a folder, the properties fields for the document type,

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as properties are associated with document and folders (col. 1, lines 60-67). Properties are not saved queries.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for searching said master file, wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries".

Panichkul teaches searching a memory to retrieve a stored search query in the memory (figs. 1 & 4, col. 8, lines 15-55). Storing search queries in a memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55). Memory is represented as a master file

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Panichkur's teaching of retrieving a stored search query from a memory, storing search queries in a memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection to Acuri's system in order to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process.

As to claim 2, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for copying metadata to automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent folder" as (col. 2, lines 40-55).

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Hornick (US 20020103689).

As to claim 3, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for assigning a security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a security level of a parent folder". Hornick teaches security level corresponding to a security level of a folder (paragraph 0086).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of security level corresponding to a security level of folder to Kitamura's system in order to protect folder from modifying folder without permission.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur") (US 6775537) and further in view of Linsey et al (or hereinafter "Linsey") ( US 7127676).

As to claim 4, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for creating a new matter folder" as (fig. 11), "creating a plurality of folders within the new matter folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10).

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " wherein creating said new master folder comprise receiving a matter type selection from a user". Linsey teaches creating a folder based on a user selection of a folder type (col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 13, lines 1-10).

It would have been. obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Linsey's teaching of creating a folder based on a user selections of a folder type to Acuri's system in order to allow a user to choice a correct folder type for storing a corresponding document type correctly.



9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Linsey and Huang (US 6571245).

As to claim 5, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation teaches the claimed limitation "creating said new master folder further comprises: receiving a list of users for the new matter folder, and adding the new matter folder to a My Matters folder for the list of users". Huang teaches adding folders to another folder (col. 8, lines 55-67; col. 9, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Huang's teaching of adding folders to another folder to Acuri's system in order to update the information in folder quickly.

10. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Linsey and Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "generating an email address for the matter folder, the email address to receive emails and filling them in a correspondence folder in the matter, folder". Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to of Acuri's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string". Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string (col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as a unique string to Acuri's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a user's address book without permission.

11. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur") (US 6775537) and further in view of Barnett (US 6369840).

As to claim 8, Acuri does not explicitly teach " a processor programmed for enabling a user to subscribe a matter file, the subscription putting a copy of a matter file in the user's My Matters list".

Barnett teaches the user can select individual event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View 314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages 313-315 (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Acuri's system in order to update a user profile or file.

As to claim 10, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "wherein said user is enabled to subscribe to another user's subscription list and wherein the user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can

access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Acuri 's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 9, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation wherein the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8, lines 35-55).

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein said user is enabled to subscribe to a matter file at a second level". Robertson teaches modify record and put the modified record in a user record (col. 3, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Roberson's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to share information of a user to another user.

13. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur") (US 6775537) and further in view of Rothkop (Us 2002/0049727).

As to claim 11, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for filling emails in an appropriate matter file". Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

As to claim 12, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for prompting a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder". Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al'(or hereinafter "Panichkul")(US 6775537) and further in view of Mccotter (US 6401097).

As to claim 13, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " a processor programmed for arranging the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the

matter file". Mccotter teaches arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mccotter's teaching of arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file to Acuri 's system in order to search documents in files of a folder quickly.

15. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for arranging the matter file into anontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent

object to Acuri 's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for propagating the metadata of each of a plurality of objects into a master folder in a hierarchical manner to simplify moving the objects into the master folder". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Acuri 's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

16. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of over Acuri (US 6915299) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and Hornick (US 20020103689).

As to claim 16, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

"a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder 68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

" the matter file including the plurality of folders" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder



68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for documents (figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g. the fields 83, 84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set for the respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some property fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The completed fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines 52-65), the properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields;

"wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders" as properties are associated with document and folders (col. 1, lines 60-67). Properties are not saved queries.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up; saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved

queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries".

Panichkul teaches "saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries" as storing search queries in a memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

Hornick teaches "setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up" as library templates, each template designed to set up a file or folder (paragraphs [0106-0107], figs. 9-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching library templates, each template designed to set up a file and Panichkul teaching of storing search queries in a memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection to Acuri's system in order to a user to create folder structures for association with a deal, a schedule of at least one meeting relating to a deal, and minutes from each meeting in order so that a user can search/retrieve information in folders easily and quickly and to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process (col. 4, lines 1-30).

As to claim 17, Acuri, Panichkul and Hornick disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Hornick further teaches the claimed limitations "the document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the document is filed" as files contain documents that are inherited metadata from a folder (paragraphs 0108, 0152).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of files contain documents that are inherited metadata from a folder to Acuri's system in order to include a robust security structure allowing companies and users on specific deals to be isolated from other deals, thereby protecting company confidential information (paragraph 0006).

As to claim 18, Acuri, Panichkul and Hornick disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Hornick further teaches the claimed limitations teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred" as files contain documents that are inherited metadata from a folder (paragraphs 0108, 0152).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of files contain documents that are inherited metadata from a folder to Acuri's system in order to include a robust security structure allowing companies and users on specific deals to be isolated from other deals, thereby protecting company confidential information (paragraph 0006).

***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bendik (US 20060195778) teaches granting access to a folder (fig. 2).

**Contact Information**

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169